

THE "JOINT" TAKES A HUMAN INVENTORY

The End of the DP Problem Is in Sight

HAL LEHRMAN

PARIS

WITH the State of Israel an accomplished fact and the peak of the overseas emergency relief program now passed, the Joint Distribution Committee has felt the need to take stock as of 1948, to review the past and weigh the future. Accordingly, in mid-November, two hundred and fifty delegates and observers of thirty-one recipient and donor countries met with representatives of the JDC and eleven cooperating organizations on the Left Bank in Paris for a world "Conference on Jewish Relief and Rehabilitation."

When Nazi Germany in the spring of 1945 yielded to the combined persuasion of Allied armies converging from West and East, she left a monument of six million Jewish corpses. Only 1,400,000 European Jews remained after the crematories and gas-chambers capitulated, and better than half of these survivors were literally more dead than alive. Whatever breath they still

were drawing seemed likely to be quite shut off by disease and hunger and the indifference of a war-ravaged continent with urgent problems of its own. As for the religious and social institutions by which European Jewry had sustained its vigorous identity in happier times, most lay in apparently irretrievable ruin. Not one organized Jewish community survived in all the lands from which the Nazis had been freshly purged.

Into this desolation came the American Joint Distribution Committee, nearly 95 per cent of its funds donated by the Jews of the United States and the remainder by the Jews of Latin America and the British Commonwealth—the Jews who had been lifted by the accidents of history beyond the reach of the German design. It is perhaps not exact to say that the JDC came into this desolation, for the Joint had been on the outskirts of the holocaust since 1940, working to rescue ten Jews here, a hundred Jews there, and a thousand somewhere else, as Hitler's armies advanced and receded. Rather, the Joint turned from the crisis of rescue to the crisis of salvage and rehabilitation.

Three and one-half years later, the plain statistics tell a great story. More than two hundred million dollars have been expended, 900 communities have been restored, 210,000 Jews have been helped to emigrate, 141,000 of them to Palestine—or, later, Israel. Of the 150,000 Jewish children still alive in Europe at the end of the war, no less than 140,000 have been taken care of by the JDC. Over 300 child-care and 500 medical institutions are operating, as well as 256 producers' cooperatives and 41 loan banks. Vocational institutes have given work-training to 135,000 Jews,

As VICTORIOUS Allied troops advanced into Hitler's Europe, the American Joint Distribution Committee, seasoned by nearly three decades of experience, was on hand to bring the first promise of rehabilitation to the Jews who remained alive. Today, more than three years after the war's end, the "Joint" continues its enormous task of bringing constructive aid to distressed Jews everywhere in the world. HAL LEHRMAN here reports on a recent international conference on Jewish relief and rehabilitation sponsored by the JDC, reviewing the accomplishments of the past, drawing a balance sheet of present needs, and looking toward new problems which may require substantial readjustment of overseas relief activity. Mr. Lehrman, well-known political analyst, is the author of *Russia's Europe*, and contributed a series of internationally-discussed articles on the changing Palestine diplomatic situation to our pages. He was born in New York City in 1911 and attended Cornell University.

85,000 students have attended Jewish schools, 400 synagogues have been rebuilt. The Joint has shipped nearly 200,000,000 pounds of relief supplies overseas, including 154,000,000 pounds of food, 750,000 pairs of new shoes, 1,400,000 pairs of socks, 500,000 new coats, 250,000 new suits, 300,000 new dresses, and 2,000,000 pieces of underwear. Some 2,600,000 cases have been treated in Joint-subsidized clinics, and 42,000,000 hot meals have been distributed in Joint-supported canteens and soup kitchens. The performance of the JDC as a private, voluntary agency has set a new mark in the peacetime history of international social service.

ON THE first day of the Conference, the crystal-chandeliered, gilt-tinted Grande Salle de Bellechasse in the Palais d'Orsay blazed with floodlights as movie cameramen and photographers recorded the proceedings. There was a welcome address from JDC Chairman Edward M. M. Warburg. In Churchillian periods Major Aubrey Eban, chief Israeli representative to the United Nations, denounced Britain's "attempt to detach two-thirds of the territory of Israel," saluted the Negev "as the future home of half a million Jews," and invited Israel's Arab "neighbors" to direct negotiations for "final determination of frontiers." Dr. Joseph J. Schwartz, JDC European Director, who had in eight years of tireless labor made the name of the Joint a synonym for salvation from Lisbon to Istanbul, reviewed the achievements of and for European Jewry since liberation and briefly surveyed the problems still seeking solution. Then, with Dr. Schwartz as permanent chairman, the conference settled down to five days of discussion guided by five major agenda topics: emigration, welfare and child care, health, new areas of need, and reconstruction.

The week's deliberations had an amiable informality undisturbed by caucuses, resolutions or votes. There were not even any motions or, in fact, any standard rules of procedure except a rare tap of the chairman's gavel. No effort was made in advance to weigh the various delegations according to

size and importance; the United States had only three delegates, no more than Hungary, while Austria had five and Israel two. Debate and division on resolutions would have been entirely meaningless. The purpose of the Conference was to exchange views, not to legislate—it being generally difficult to decree the disposition of someone else's funds.

As the days went by, one became increasingly aware that the Conference could be described, without derogatory intention, less as a parliament than as a Wailing Wall. For the first time since the Nazi blight had descended upon them, the spokesmen of decimated European Jewry were given the opportunity to relate their *tsoros* (the Conference's official language was Yiddish) in plenary assembly. The catharsis was complete and wholesome. But in addition the disjointed branches of the Jewish family, so long separated by death and destruction, now were able to reaffirm their kinship with each other and with the new and ancient Israel. As they talked, day after day, a feeling of harmony steadily grew—certain delegates from the "popular democracies" of Eastern Europe apart.

NATURALLY, there were also grievances. Delegates from some of the donating countries complained, among other things, about duplication of cost and effort between the Joint and other agencies, about the need for training local personnel instead of stocking the far-flung Joint offices with expensively imported American professionals, about the tendency of emigrants already settled in one haven to use the Joint as a free "travel bureau," about the general belief among European Jews that the Joint's resources were inexhaustible—verily a "*yam mit gelt*." In turn, the delegates from receiving countries complained that they sometimes did not get sufficient money for projects which they considered eminently worthy, that the Joint did not do enough for propagation of Jewish religious life (or did too much for it), that the Joint meddled in politics (or failed to meddle in politics), and so on. To this

writer, as to any other correspondent who has reported from Middle Europe since the war, the chronicle of grievances was already classically familiar.

Rising high above the note of annoyance, however, was the nearly universal chorus of praise and gratitude for the Joint and all its works. The gentlemen from Poland and Czechoslovakia were careful to qualify their admiration by giving even louder voice to the "benefactions" showered on the Jewish community by their respective "democratic" regimes. The gentlemen from Sofia likewise intimated at frequent intervals that the advent of Georgi Dimitrov's Communist era had been the most blessed event in the history of Bulgarian Jewry. For the rest, however, delegation after delegation affirmed and reiterated that it had been the Joint, and nothing but the Joint, which had come speedily, generously, and effectively to their side in every moment of distress, and that without the Joint neither they nor their constituencies would have sufficient strength or life to make any complaints at all. Not only did almost every speaker embroider this theme but many rose to refute minor reservations made by a previous speaker or some criticism overheard in the lobby (for this Conference, like all international assemblies, had its lobby too, where at least as much conferring went on as inside the hall).

The prevailing sentiment seemed to be that the JDC had perpetrated no more sins of omission and commission than any comparable organization of its size and diversity was entitled to, and probably less. In the final speech of the Conference, Dr. Schwartz expressed his mild surprise at the relatively small amount of criticism. If it had been up to him, he assured the delegates, he could have thought of a considerably larger number of complaints to be charged against his organization. Authoritatively but tactfully, and with an extemporaneous eloquence in Yiddish which quite fulfilled its claim to the dignity of an international language, he took up each major criticism in turn and gave a reasoned reply. He noted, for instance, that the Joint was neither for nor

against encouragement of the purely religious phases of Jewish rehabilitation but simply supported those religious or non-religious cultural projects which the various Jewish communities themselves desired; that in the whole of JDC's European staff there were only some two hundred Americans and more than four thousand paid local employees; that JDC's overlapping of function with HIAS, with ORT, with Union-OSE or any other welfare group was far less extensive than advertised; that coordination for its own sake was not necessarily an unmitigated virtue, the main thing being to get the job done; that nevertheless a serious effort was being made to work out a common plan of action with the other agencies; that the Joint's much-bruited disagreements with the World Jewish Congress were considerably exaggerated, the WJC having stated its intention to stay out of relief work and the Joint having reaffirmed its determination, as always, to stay out of politics. When he concluded his remarks, the Conference gave Dr. Schwartz a standing ovation.

THE Schwartz speech, listed on the agenda as a "resumé" of the Conference's proceedings, was really an official, basic statement of the JDC's present program and future prospects. For two days after Conference adjournment, the directors of the Joint's world-wide regional offices met six hours daily to study mutual problems and receive new instructions. From these discussions and the Schwartz survey—and from numerous private talks with competent sources—the following salient conclusions emerge:

1. Emigration is the major target. The DP camps are to have first priority, the Moslem countries second. The situation in the DP camps will be liquidated within twelve months. The largest part of the emigration will flow toward Israel, some to the United States, with a trickle to other territories.

2. Eastern Europe will continue to get help. Every effort will be made to assist the emigration of all Jews who want and are

able to get out of countries in the Soviet orbit. But those who want or have to remain will not be written off the JDC rolls. An estimated three years will be required for their readjustment.

3. Emphasis in relief and rehabilitation is to shift from Europe to the Moslem lands, especially North Africa. First objectives there are children and young people, their health and education. JDC allocations for North Africa and the Middle East will be two and one-half times greater next year than this.

4. To do a complete job overseas in 1949, the JDC needs \$70,000,000. This is about \$28,000,000 less than the Joint asked for in 1948—but more, it is feared, than the coming fund-raising campaign in the United States may provide.

WHATEVER the abundance or scarcity of dollars for overseas, emigration is Priority No. 1. Thirty per cent of the JDC's current budget goes to emigration. This percentage will continue and even increase; only a complete drying-up of funds can force revision of this policy.

No matter what the destination selected by the individual migrant, the fixed principle and purpose of the JDC will be to help him reach it. But the fact is that Israel is the haven that most Jews are choosing and the one most ready and eager to receive them. In the past ten months, 85,000 have gone there. Thirty thousand have entered in the past three months, an average of 10,000 monthly, and this average is soon expected to reach 15,000. The Israeli government, through the Jewish Agency, is cooperating fully and efficiently in the granting of visas and the expediting of travel. (An example of record speed was set recently in the issuance of Israeli visas to 5,000 refugee Jews marooned in Shanghai as Chinese Communist armies swept southward.)

Apart from the over-all problems of economic absorptivity, immigration into Israel is currently hampered by a severe housing shortage. That it is not crippling is due to the accessibility of houses and areas evacu-

ated by the fleeing Arabs during the recent hostilities. Fifteen thousand immigrant Jews have been installed in deserted Jaffa. More have found shelter in the Arab parts of Haifa, and others are being sent on to the nearly empty towns of Acre, Safed, and Tiberias. Some minor construction has been done but neither the skilled manpower nor the materials for large-scale building is available at the moment.

Nevertheless a flood of immigration will not only be permitted but encouraged for the plain and simple reason that the new State of Israel vitally needs a population. The political realities of the situation push aside the economic realities. Israel is hungry for people. People to go into Upper Galilee, people to colonize the Negev, people to occupy Lydda and Ramleh. And all these places must be filled and securely settled as rapidly as possible.

In this enterprise the JDC is cooperating to the limits of its ability. The urgency, responsible Joint officials feel, is not so much Zionist as Jewish. "Once in the history of every people," Dr. Schwartz told the Paris Conference, "it is given the opportunity to build itself a home. We cannot and will not neglect the opportunity in Israel." The JDC is convinced that the Jews of the Old World need the guarantee of a homeland in Israel, and that the Jews of the New World, whatever their private political views, will applaud the use of their donations in supplying Israel with the men and women needed to consolidate its future.

EDWARD WARBURG pledged the Conference that the DP's henceforth would be known as DI's—"Destined for Israel." The phrase applies, at least, to those displaced persons in Austria, Germany, and Italy who are physically qualified for admission to Israel. There are in Germany today approximately 112,000 Jewish refugees, 23,000 more in Austria, and 10,000 in Italy—a total of 145,000. Among these are the aged, who have to stand back because Tel Aviv is giving priority to the more productive categories; the tubercular, who with their families

account for six or seven thousand in the non-emigrable group; partisan fighters and soldiers who lost limbs or were otherwise incapacitated during the war; and the chronically ill. The current rate of emigration to Israel is six thousand per month, and all signs indicate that this figure will soon rise to 7,500.

If this is so, 90,000 will depart within the next year. During the same period the emigration to the United States, even under the present unsatisfactory legislation, plus the foreseeable trickle to Canada and Australia, ought to account for another 10,000 departures. In effect, therefore, the displaced-persons problem in Middle Europe will be solved by the end of 1949.

This will not solve the problem for the whole of Europe, however. In France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland there are another 25,000 Jewish refugees in need of resettlement. If they seek it in Israel, they will be required to wait their turn until the camps have been emptied. For them (and for those in the camps to whom Israel is barred for reasons of age or incapacity) a quicker way out would be to an overseas territory.

Latin America, which was fairly liberal with its visas last year, has since become steadily less hospitable. The condition may improve, but right now the doors of the Southern continent are practically shut. The maximum estimated possibility of Jewish emigration to Australia by the end of 1949 is 6,400, to Canada only 3,000. The likeliest destination is the United States. Although the 1948 Immigration Law authorized the entry of 205,000 DP's to the United States, its discriminatory language cut the Jewish immigration permissible under it to 20,000 and it is doubtful whether even that many will be able to get past our vigilant consulates abroad. However, President Truman and other Democratic party spokesmen repeatedly assailed the law's anti-Semitic overtones during the recent campaign. Unless political oratory means nothing at all, the White House and the incoming Democratic Congress may be confidently expected to

amend the law in favor of increased Jewish refugee immigration.

IN EASTERN EUROPE, inhabited by more than 700,000 Jews, JDC's life is complicated not only by the problem of finding places for emigrants to go to but by the uncertainty of getting the emigrants out of the places where they are now.

True, at the moment of writing the various Soviet-satellite regimes are being rather cooperative in facilitating Jewish exit. Contrary to suggestions by the British Foreign Office and other sources, this does not prove that the Jews are Communist agents sent out to establish fifth columns abroad. On the contrary, it indicates that Jews are eager to put distance between themselves and the "people's democracies." It also suggests that the governments in the area are glad to be relieved of responsibility for protection of large numbers of Jews against the anti-Semitism of the native populations. As this writer can testify from direct observation, even those Jews in Eastern Europe who have taken on the Communist label are "Communists" only for convenience, and demonstrate their real convictions by flocking en masse to register on Zionist emigration rolls. And it is illuminating to note that in Rumania, the only East European country where emigration is now at a standstill, the deadlock exists because the "official" Jewish Communists, representing the government, insist on the right of "selecting" the Jews eligible for emigration and the Zionists refuse to let them.

In the rest of Russia's Europe, emigration is admittedly easier at the moment. But there are ominous signs, and an imminent turn for the worse is widely feared. The Zionists in Prague were operating camps in which twenty-three hundred Jews of military age—now on the verge of departure—received "training for productive life" in Israel. But the Czechoslovak government has suddenly barred further recruiting and ordered the camps to close. The Prague practice of granting passports to large groups is being suspended. Clearances will be given

only to individual applicants, which inevitably means a drastic cut.

In Yugoslavia, while four thousand have just departed, there is no hint of accommodation for the 6,000 who still remain. Although a few thousand may be expected to leave Poland, Warsaw has lately tightened its passport policy, intimating that foreign Jewish funds might better be applied toward aiding those particular Jews who desire to consecrate themselves to the task of building the Polish "people's democracy." Hungary, which has 160,000 Jews, has agreed to let a slim 2,000 go, but only on an individual basis. From Bulgaria some 11,000 Jews have departed since Liberation, and perhaps 15,000 more may get out by early 1949. But at least 20,000 will have to stay; even apart from the fact that scarcely a Jewish family in Bulgaria is without relatives already in Israel, there is excellent ground to believe that only a fraction of these will remain out of sheer devotion to the new Bulgarian republic.

Why is satellite policy toward emigration changing? One reason, according to private reports, is that the Jewish exodus has been stirring unrest among the non-Jewish populations. Many Gentile citizens of the new democracies would also like to take leave of Eastern Europe, and are encouraged by the Jewish example to hope that some day their chance will come too. Also, significant signs are visible of growing Soviet discontent with political developments in Israel itself. A recent article by the Moscow weather-vane, Ilya Ehrenburg, which was anything but gracious about Israeli trends, was widely reproduced in the satellite press—this phenomenon never occurs by accident. Finally, pressure is probably coming from the handful of dyed-in-the-wool professional Jewish Communists who see their "constituencies" dwindling and are worried that continued emigration will deprive them of their self-appointed "leadership" of the non-existent "revolutionary Jewish masses."

SOME of these "leaders" turned up at the Paris Conference and brought with them that rare "democratic" mentality which has

become *de rigueur* eastward of the Trieste-Stettin line. The delegations were of two distinct categories. In the first were the bona fide Jewish community representatives of pre-war vintage, men retained because of their usefulness as window dressing but divested of all independence. I recognized the delegate from Yugoslavia. Even as far back as 1945, he was too intimidated to give me anything but official slogans when I visited him in Belgrade. This time I refrained from embarrassing him with conversation. The Hungarians, too, were represented by three pre-war community spokesmen, for the Orthodox, Neologue (Conservative), and Zionist groups. Nobody who knows how matters stand in Eastern Europe could resent the cautious platitudes they uttered at the Conference. For them the gamble must be like the one taken by the Persian Jew who was forced to agree to forfeit his head unless he could make the Shah's cat talk, but obtained a year's respite to accomplish it. When asked why he was risking the impossible he replied: "In a year I may die anyway. The Shah may die. Even the cat may die. Who knows what can happen in a year?"

The Rumanian delegation fell into no category, because it never got to Paris at all, for reasons which remain obscure. But the rest of the contingents from Russia's Europe were eminently characteristic of the New Order. All of them were inveterate Communists, and practically all had "spontaneously" associated themselves with the Jewish communities only since the Communist grab of power.

As if to show the latest fashion in Communist manners, Czechoslovakia, the newest democracy, sent two delegates who alternated between sneering and scowling in the Conference hall and swaggering in the lobby. One of them stayed mildly plastered through the entire week. He assured me affectionately that he was a Jew in name only and had come to the rescue of the Prague community only when its "reactionary" leaders were fleeing the country after the February "putsch." (I learned elsewhere that this worthy's previous participation in Jewish affairs had been in connection with an OSE health project,

wherein he was actively disrupting the program when the Communist coup raised him to higher things.) One of the two Bulgarian delegates, with whom I had had some vigorous exchanges in Sofia two years previously concerning terroristic practices of the up-and-coming Communists, was now an important enough party stalwart to be in charge of all housing in Sofia, a post equivalent to vice-lord mayor of the capital. The chief of the Warsaw delegation was no less than the brother of Jacob Berman, reputed to be the real boss of Poland. Perhaps the most pertinent address delivered by any East European spokesman came from one of Berman's colleagues, on the subject of emigration. Israel is fine for those who want to go there, he said, but it should not seduce good workers from their democratic labors in Poland. The slogan "Out of Europe" is false. The slogan of Polish Jewry ought to be "Fight"—fight against Polish fascism and build anew in Europe under the benevolent aegis of the Soviet Union. Not only Poland's Jews but all Jews everywhere should join hands in support of the USSR, the greatest force in the world for reconstruction and for peace.

In his urbane opening remarks to the conference, "Doctor Schwartz of the Joint" emphatically thanked the satellite regimes for their cooperative attitude on emigration. It was a tongue-in-cheek acknowledgment. The regimes in question certainly know that a great many Jews have managed to depart without benefit of passport. It also turned out to be a kind of diplomatic finesse, because Dr. Schwartz immediately tacked onto his thanks a pointed appeal for "continuation" of the alleged cooperation. The truth is that hard negotiations are now going on to talk the satellite governments out of clamping down on the exodus. Otherwise, there are only about three more months in which Jews may still be able to get out legally. Tel Aviv is especially concerned because plans are also under way for the resettlement in Israel of some 350,000 Jews from the Moslem lands. Israeli authorities want to have as many Jews of European background as possible in the

country before the altogether different group of North African and Middle Eastern Jews arrives in quantity. It seems to them preferable to have the presently dominant Westernized strain in Israel absorb the Oriental newcomers, rather than be absorbed by them.

THROUGHOUT the Conference the delegate from Australia, a donating country, kept up a running word-battle with the East European delegations. He argued that in the "people's democracies" there was precious little that was either popular or democratic, that the Jews should consequently get out as quickly as possible, and that the Joint should not lavishly dispense its funds there or behave as if it were a "Marshall Plan" for Eastern Europe.

It must be reported that a good many delegates and observers from the more westerly countries listened sympathetically to the Australian's remarks. It is also true that the Joint would like nothing better than to help the emigration of every Jew from Eastern Europe who desired to leave, in which case that region would be virtually depopulated of Jews within the space of two years. But since this is not possible, the Joint considers that it cannot leave East Europe's Jews high and dry simply because the prevailing political outlook in that area may be repugnant. The JDC will refrain from cultural and long-term projects calculated to encourage the Jews to stay in Russia's Europe forever. But a limited three-year plan of "reconstruction"—based on vocational training, the final "tooling-up" of producers' cooperatives, and the final financing of loan societies—will be resolutely executed in the hope that those young Jews and economically displaced Jews who cannot get out of Eastern Europe will be given sufficient instruction and equipment to keep alive thereafter with a minimum of assistance from abroad.

As the emergency created in Europe by Hitler has abated, the plight of Jewry in the Moslem lands has advanced to the foreground, until the problem became a major topic on the agenda of the Paris

conference. The fate of the Jews of Europe was dramatic and came upon them like a sudden, sweeping plague. The condition of a million Sephardic Jews in North Africa and the Middle East has been chronic, as untheatrical as the slow deadliness of consumption. The recent Palestine troubles exacerbated the condition by inflaming the Arabs in the surrounding countries (pogroms have already flared in Aden, Tripolitania, and Morocco) and by making the Jewish minorities more conscious of their agony. But the fundamental crisis has been there for centuries. In Algeria, under civilizing French influence, Jews enjoy full citizenship, but nearly everywhere else in the Moslem world (especially in Morocco, Tunisia, Tripolitania, Cyrenaica, Yemen, Aden, Iran, and Iraq) they are still in the Middle Ages.

I SHALL never forget my first glimpse, in 1943, of the Mellah—the ghetto—of Casablanca. The Jews there are indistinguishable from the Moroccans except by the color of the one-piece galabiyah which is all they have for clothing. If anything, their miseries are even greater than those of their Arab neighbors. For housing, the Jews of the Moslem countries inhabit hovels; without windows, doors, sun, air, or water; garbage, filth, and disease are omnipresent. One out of every four Jewish children alive at birth dies before the end of its first year. Typhus, typhoid, tuberculosis, favus, and rickets are endemic. Trachoma and conjunctivitis reap an appalling harvest in blindness. The general level of nutrition is hardly above the level of Auschwitz, and the level of sanitation is actually below it. When the bare facts of Oriental Jewish life were narrated at the Paris Conference, the shock was so acute that, then and there, delegates from the German and Austrian DP camps arose to urge that allocations for their own maintenance be cut in favor of relief for the depressed Jews of the Near East.

The JDC first began to take direct note of this ancient zone of Jewish suffering in 1940, when Joint installations were set up in Morocco for European Jews crossing

North Africa in their flight from Hitler. The Alliance Israélite Universelle, subsidized by French government funds and private donations, was the only sizeable Jewish welfare group operating in the vast stretches between the southern tip of the Arabian Peninsula and the borders of Afghanistan. Primarily educational in purpose, the ninety-year-old Alliance today runs more than one hundred schools dispersed through the Moslem world, including the fine agricultural institute of Mikveh Israel near Tel Aviv.

In the last few years, JDC has appropriated modest subsidies for the Alliance, but the latter's activity, excellent as far as it has gone, has barely scratched the surface of the problem. Its network of schools has a registration of 49,000 students—but there are 150,000 children of school age. OSE (*Oeuvre de Secours aux Enfants*) has opened a few dispensaries—but only in Tunisia and Morocco. ORT, largely subsidized by Joint funds, operates vocational training schools in Algeria and Morocco—with a total enrollment of only 1,000 students. The JDC supports a few kindergartens in Tripoli and Tunis, and some school canteens—for only 12,000 children. In 1947, the JDC was able to allot only \$500,000 to the less publicized crisis in the Moslem world. In 1948 this subvention was raised to \$800,000—about one-hundredth of the total budgetary allotment for this year.

The Joint, at last able to reduce its European budget, now means to pay more attention to this newly discovered Mediterranean area of need. This does not mean, however, that next year's program will see any tremendous step-up in the size of the allocation. To begin with, hostile territories like the Lebanon, Iraq, and Egypt will not even allow help for their Jewish minorities to come in from abroad. More important, although large amounts of money and personnel might be poured into European-controlled North Africa, no commensurate good could be accomplished by such an outlay. With the misery so vast and universal, the abysmally backward native Jewish populations simply do not have the organization,

consciousness or equipment to utilize a sudden deluge of funds.

The beginning, therefore, will be concentrated on the adults of the future, not of today. The stress will be on child feeding, medical care, primary school education, and vocational training—the latter with special emphasis on preparing the younger generations for useful lives either in their native countries or in Israel. It is expected that five years will be needed for substantial accomplishments to be recorded. JDC technicians have already made one welfare and two medical surveys and an educational survey is now in progress. Existing agencies like the Alliance and ORT will be utilized to the full. Where the Joint itself goes into the field, it will operate—as usual—through whatever local institutions exist. The ultimate design will be to raise the level of community awareness to a point where, at some future time, the local population will have the trained personnel, the installations, the capacity, and the desire to carry on for and by themselves.

THE BIG question-mark in the Joint's prospectus is the uncertainty of the response which American Jewry—long cooperative and long magnanimous—will give after the new appeal for contributions is sounded in 1949.

Even without the natural fatigue of purses stretched to meet the demands of the UJA campaign which is just closing—while it failed to raise the \$250,000,000, it did achieve the unprecedented sum of \$150,000,000—the trend is setting in heavily among American communities to look after their local welfare, religious, and educational institutions, which have been largely neglected in favor of the overseas crisis of

war, relief, and rehabilitation. These demands may cut severely into allocations for disbursements abroad. Furthermore, the emergence of the State of Israel, while it has inspired American Jewry to contribute more generously than ever before, has also encouraged an anarchy of separatist appeals for funds and supplies. Since May 14, when Israel declared its sovereign independence, no less than fifty new American agencies, responsible or irresponsible, have requested licenses to conduct individual campaigns on behalf of the fledgling state. However excellent their intention, these groups threaten to reduce the efficiency and results of the previously unified UJA effort. Moreover, the intense enthusiasm for Israel is bound to bring pressure on the Joint to take less for overseas expenditures out of the UJA's 1949 treasury and leave more for direct aid to the newly-born Jewish homeland.

The JDC is asking for a smaller budget than last year and is preparing for possibly rigorous cuts wherever possible in maintenance of its own staffs overseas. Expenditures for child-care, canteens, cash relief grants, and similar projects are taking a natural downward turn as more and more clients become self-sufficient or are resettled outside of Europe. But slightly larger funds will be needed for the reconstruction program, and even more for the priority requirements of immigration. It costs an average of \$120 to resettle one displaced person—which means close to \$2,000,000 each month for resettlement alone out of the total JDC budget for this year of \$70,000,000. It needs no argument to see that it would be an obvious disaster if the JDC, so near to the culmination of its errand of mercy and its restoration of a broken people, should be impeded in the final hours.